

of prevention and education programs that we ought to be doing for young people in this country. But that statement of the Helms-Burton amendment said to the world, you have got the problem, do not bring it over here. Clearly, this was not looking at our own position.

Now, the reason that conference in Barcelona was so important is that it is starting to talk about more and more advances of treatment and more and more complicated illnesses being found. There is all kinds of research there, but one must not lose sight of the fact that education and prevention still are the best hope for the world. We can have retroviral therapy, and we want that, and we should push the drug companies, and we should do everything possible, but administering those drugs and monitoring them, and it is as somebody described it, savage therapy. It is tough treatment. It is not an easy regimen. It has only so much effectiveness.

The real thing we have to get is people educated and aware of their own status. That is not expensive. If we would spend the money for the diagnostic tools that we have available and developed in this United States by USAID, we could make it possible for everyone to know their status. So at least they would know whether or not they were passing it on to their partner. But we do not put our money where our mouth is.

We say we want to do things for the world. We go and we make speeches, we put up a little bit of money, and then we double-count it so it looks like more. But the fact is, the United States is not putting up their fair share. Kofi Annan asked for an enormous contribution, said how much would be necessary, and the United States put up a pitiful amount.

Our contribution is something like 0.1 percent of our gross domestic product. The Norwegians, the Swedes, the Danes, the Dutch put up 0.2, 0.3 percent. Why can these little countries do that and we, the country with all the resources in the world, not put the money into the Global AIDS Fund that Kofi Annan has set up, or through our USAID? Or there are many ways in which we could put that money out there, but it requires a commitment.

Now, thanks to the work of people like the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILENDER-MCDONALD) and other Members of the Congress, the devastation that is occurring in Africa is now much better understood than it was 10 years ago.

I remember in 1991 having lunch with the President of Zambia, Mr. Kaunda, who said, what will I do with 500,000 orphans? Today, we are dealing with those orphans worldwide. And if we do not do something about it, it will not be 500,000, it will be millions and millions and millions of orphans. We must do more.

HIV AND AIDS IN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the outstanding work that she has done in her tireless efforts to bring to the attention of America, the Congress, and the world the need for us to do much more as relates to the HIV and AIDS pandemic; and also the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), a physician, who also has been spearheading this. Let me commend them for attending the 14th International Conference on AIDS where the question of HIV and AIDS, of course, was the center of discussion.

It has been indicated that AIDS will kill at least 68 million people by 2020 unless rich nations invest far more in global prevention, says a report that was released last week. It is now clear to me that we have only seen the beginning of the worst epidemic in human history, says Peter Piot, Director of the joint United Nations program for HIV and AIDS, UNAIDS. He said that the disease will not only destabilize Africa but it will affect economic and political stability worldwide, particularly when the epidemic begins to peak in the most populated countries, such as China, India, and Russia.

The UNAIDS update, released ahead of the planned meeting that started on July 7 in Barcelona, indicates the number will grow to 40 million people worldwide, there has been a jump of 6 million cases, new cases, in 2 years, and that the infection rate continues to steadily rise in India, China, Russia, and Eastern Europe.

So we have a very, very serious situation. This terrorism is far more deadly than anything we could ever imagine. As we have indicated, the numbers are staggering, and AIDS is ripping through every continent destroying everything in its path. But let me concentrate a bit on Africa.

Botswana is currently experiencing the worst of the pandemic, with over 30 percent of its population affected. South Africa has also been hard hit. It is estimated that one out of three adults are infected. We have seen, to date, with President Mbeki, that there currently is really no national agenda to deal with the problem. We have seen statistics from Zimbabwe which say that 35 percent of that population has been infected with HIV and AIDS.

In many instances, the largest number of victims are from the public service sector: teachers, civil servants. So we can imagine what that will mean for most of the developed world when we are losing the leaders in those countries, with 14 percent of the teachers in South Africa infected. The rate is expected to increase to 30 percent in 10 years. So we have a very, very serious problem.

What we need to do, though, is to increase the amount of funds that are available. On the eve of the G8 meeting, President Bush announced a new initiative to address the pandemic through a pledge of an additional \$500 million over 3 years to help prevent mother-to-child transmission in parts of Africa and the Caribbean. As little as a single dose of medication to mother and child at birth is reported to prevent transmission 50 percent of the time.

While this is a positive step, it does not address the problem itself. The disease many times is transmitted through sexual activity, but this initiative focuses on the least politically sensitive aspect of care and treatment. U.S. AIDS programs, through the Agency for International Development, focus on education and do not offer treatment. Fewer than 2 percent of the people living with AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa have access to antiretroviral drugs that are saving lives and improving the quality of life for those who are fortunate enough to receive them.

So focusing primarily on the innocent newborns, Bush's pledge leaves out women and children and communities and families. So I urge that we push and stress that the U.S. House of Representatives step up to the plate and offer additional funding.

BARCELONA CONFERENCE ON HIV-AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I stand here, along with my colleagues, to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her leadership on the issue of the AIDS pandemic internationally. My colleague already read the declaration from the Barcelona conference. I am going to read the whereas clauses, because I think they set forth specifically the status of this AIDS pandemic internationally.

"Whereas every single day AIDS claims 8,500 lives, or the equivalent of three World Trade Center disasters daily;

Whereas by December 2001, 40 million people were living with HIV-AIDS, and by 2005 an estimated 100 million will be infected;

Whereas more than 40 million children, most of them in developing nations, will be orphaned by AIDS by 2010;

Whereas the World Health Organization this year has stated that the antiretroviral treatment is medically essential and has issued specific treatment guidelines, monitoring standards, and regimen recommendations;

Whereas those on treatment represent less than 2 percent of all those infected with HIV because such treatment is almost completely unavailable in developing nations;

□ 1730

Whereas, over 500 nongovernmental organizations globally have endorsed the Barcelona March for Life, which demands treatment access to at least 2 million people in the developing world by the time of the 2004 International Conference on AIDS in Bangkok;

Whereas these organizations represent AIDS activists from Africa, Asia and the Pacific Islands, Australia, Europe, Central and South America, and North America, therefore, we declare as activists pledged to life for all persons with HIV/AIDS that we are committed to the following goals, which the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has set forth.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to represent the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) at World AIDS Day in Seattle 2 years ago during the WTO, and it was my pleasure to sit on her behalf. What was most interesting to me was the fact that an epidemiologist came and testified before the organization that there were hundreds and thousands of grandparents raising grandchildren because the parents of these children have been infected with the HIV/AIDS virus and, therefore, were unable to take care of their own children. So grandparents are taking care of as many as 25 of their grandchildren.

I think we need to pay attention to, as the United States of America, and when we start thinking about the companies and corporations that are doing business in these developing countries, that they will not have available to them the workers to do the work in these countries. We need to pay attention to the HIV/AIDS virus and pay attention not only in developing countries, but in our own Nation.

In the United States, 950,000 have been diagnosed with AIDS. African Americans make up 13 percent of the total U.S. population, but 54 percent of the new infections, 82 percent of the women who are newly infected with HIV/AIDS are African American and Latino.

The time is up for us to sit back and believe the HIV/AIDS virus is affecting people other than Americans and we can just think about it being in another country and not deal with the issue.

I stand here in support of the Barcelona Declaration. I stand here in support of it on behalf of all the people of the world, but particularly on behalf of the people of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, and I salute the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her work in this area.

PRESIDENT BUSH REFUSES TO SUPPORT REAL REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, President Bush

gave a major speech on his administration's plan to curb executive greed and corporate misgovernance in America.

Why was the President's speech so poorly received? Why did the markets drop by several hundred points in the 2 days following the speech? Why did so many Wall Street workers who attended the speech ask, How much of this speech was politics, and how much of it is about real change?

Because despite his calls for corporate America to clean its act, President Bush, at the behest of his corporate sponsors, his major contributors, his political base, his political friends, continues to oppose real reform on Capitol Hill. He has refused to support pension and accounting reform and takes millions of dollars from the securities and accounting professions. He will not support legislation to halt offshore tax avoidance, while receiving contributions from many major companies who have moved offshore to avoid paying those taxes. His budget severely underfunds the Securities and Exchange Commission.

To make matters worse, the President has pushed to turn the public program of Medicare over to the health insurance industry and to HMOs, again while receiving millions of dollars from that health industry for his campaign and for Republican campaigns in the House and Senate.

The President also advocates turning Social Security over to the same Wall Street banks that advised American investors to buy WorldCom, Enron, Adelphia, and Bristol-Myers, and all those others companies over the last few years, while their analysts have privately ridiculed these companies and investors.

More recently, the President endorsed a prescription drug plan that would be administered by the health insurance industry and would make no provision for dealing with the skyrocketing prices American seniors pay for prescription drugs, simply because the President and Republican leaders in this Congress do not want to upset the prescription drug industry.

Apparently, the President has been convinced by the brand-name drug industry that prices simply are not a problem. The plan would undercut seniors' purchasing power and enable the drug industry to sustain its outrageous drug prices by permitting the continued abuse and manipulation of drug patent laws. Three weeks ago in the Committee on Energy and Commerce as we were marking up the drug bill, the chairman notified us that we would be quitting at 5 p.m., even though we had 20 more hours of work to do, because all of the Republican Members trooped off to a \$30 million fundraiser headlined by President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, and underwritten by the prescription drug industry.

The Chair of this fundraiser was the CEO of Glaxo, a British drug company which donated \$250,000 to that event. The next day when we returned to busi-

ness and our committee continued its markup on the prescription drug bill, amendment after amendment after amendment that was pro consumer was defeated because the drug companies wanted those amendments defeated.

The insurance industry has written legislation for the White House and the Republican leadership on Medicare privatization. The chemical industry has written legislation for the Republican leadership and the White House on environmental policy. The oil industry has written for Republican leadership and the White House legislation on energy. Wall Street has written for the White House and Republican leadership legislation on privatizing Social Security; and the prescription drug industry has written legislation dealing with pharmaceuticals for the White House and Republican leadership.

Coincidentally, Mr. Speaker, the most recent example of the President taking industry's side comes from today's headlines and also concerns prescription drugs. To avoid more questions about corporate accountability, President Bush left town today to give a speech in Minnesota on prescription drugs, and of course to headline a Republican fundraiser, his 34th this year, while we fight the war on terrorism.

The speech is timed to coincide with the release of an administration report, which conveniently concludes that the drug industry, America's most profitable industry year after year after year over the last 20 years, and an industry which enjoys the lowest tax rate of any industry year after year, his report concludes that the drug industry will be harmed by additional regulatory burdens, by lower prices imposed in part by this Congress.

Democrats are more concerned about the burden on seniors and their families who are being gouged by the predatory pricing of the pharmaceutical industry. That is why we support a direct prescription drug benefit with guaranteed coverage inside Medicare, not an insurance policy plan written by the drug industry.

Mr. Speaker, when will the administration do work in the public interest rather than on corporate interests?

CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that this new hour follows that last 5-minute presentation which was a perfectly classic example of partisan rhetoric aimed more to gain political favor than to shed light on an issue.

What we are going to do for the next hour is exactly the opposite, that is, my colleagues from the Committee on Energy and Commerce are going to talk about how we can, in bipartisan fashion, deal with the corporate malaise, the corporate scandals that have